# Matrix-F5 algorithms over finite-precision complete discrete valuation fields

Tristan Vaccon
Université de Rennes 1
tristan.vaccon@univ-rennes1.fr

arXiv:1403.5464v1 [cs.SC] 20 Mar 2014

## ABSTRACT

Let $(f_1, \ldots, f_s) \in \mathbb{Q}_p[X_1, \ldots, X_n]^s$ be a sequence of homogeneous polynomials with $p$-adic coefficients. Such system may happen, for example, in arithmetic geometry. Yet, since $\mathbb{Q}_p$ is not an effective field, classical algorithm does not apply.

We provide a definition for an approximate Gröbner basis with respect to a monomial order $w$. We design a strategy to compute such a basis, when precision is enough and under the assumption that the input sequence is regular and the ideals $\langle f_1, \ldots, f_i \rangle$ are weakly-$w$-ideals. The conjecture of Moreno-Socias states that for the grevlex ordering, such sequences are generic.

Two variants of that strategy are available, depending on whether one lean more on precision or time-complexity. For the analysis of these algorithms, we study the loss of precision of the Gauss row-echelon algorithm, and apply it to an adapted Matrix-F5 algorithm. Numerical examples are provided.

## Categories and Subject Descriptors

I.1.2 [**Computing Methodologies**]: Symbolic and Algebraic Manipulations—*Algebraic Algorithms*

## General Terms

Algorithms, Theory

## Keywords

Gröbner bases, F5 algorithm, $p$-adic precision, $p$-adic algorithm, Moreno-Socias conjecture

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Ideal study and polynomial system solving are crucial problem in computer algebra, with numerous applications, either theoretical (as in algebraic geometry) or in applied mathematics (as in cryptography). To that intent, Gröbner bases computation is a decisive tool.

Permission to make digital or hard copies of all or part of this work for personal or classroom use is granted without fee provided that copies are not made or distributed for profit or commercial advantage and that copies bear this notice and the full citation on the first page. To copy otherwise, to republish, to post on servers or to redistribute to lists, requires prior specific permission and/or a fee.
Copyright 20XX ACM X-XXXXX-XX-X/XX/XX ...$15.00.

Meanwhile, if $K = \mathbb{Q}_p$, $\mathbb{Q}((t))$ or $\mathbb{F}_q((t))$, the advent of arithmetic geometry has seen the emergence of questions that are purely over $K$, instead of methods over $K$ to solve problems over $\mathbb{Q}$ or $\mathbb{F}_p$. Following the works of Taylor and Wiles in [25], an example of such study is that of $p$-adic varieties parameterizing $p$-adic representations of $p$-adic Galois groups. Caruso and Lubicz provide in [4] a typical example of such a study. Yet, to study such varieties, no practical survey of Gröbner bases over fields like $K$ are actually available. It is therefore natural to investigate which computations of Gröbner bases can be performed over $K$.

In this document, we present a way to deal with Gröbner bases for ideals of $K[X_1, \ldots, X_n]$ with strong assomption on their structure. In that case, we provide a matrix-F5 algorithm to compute an approximate Gröbner bases of such an ideal, while being able to certify the leading monomials of the ideal.

### Related works

In the last few decades, the need for approximate Gröbner bases for computation over floating-point numbers has risen many studies about such bases. Sasaki and Kako provide in [19] [20] a wonderful introduction to this topic, by classifying the cancellation that might happen when handling floating-point number. Shirayanagi & Sweedler [23], Kondratyev, Stetter & Winkler [11], Nagasaka [14], Stetter [24], Traverso & Zanoni [26], Faugère & Liang [7] and many more have contributed to this topic. Yet, their point of view was always that of floating-point, whose behaviour is not identical to that of $\mathbb{Q}_p$ or formal series.

Meanwhile, a $p$-adic approach to Gröbner bases has been studied by Winkler [27], Pauer [16], Gräbe [10], Arnold [1], and Renault and Yokoyama [17]. Yet, their works all rely on the choice of a specific $p$, adapted to the problem over $\mathbb{Q}$ or $\mathbb{Z}$ they study.

### Main results

For $K = \mathbb{Q}_p$, $\mathbb{Q}((t))$ or $\mathbb{F}_q((t))$, polynomials in $K[X_1, \ldots, X_n]$ can only be handled with finite precision over the coefficients. If $(f_1, \ldots, f_s)$ are known only up to a small unknown perturbation on their coefficients, an approximate Gröbner basis would be polynomials $(g_1, \ldots, g_t)$ known only up to finite precision, compatible with the small perturbations on the coefficients of the $(f_1, \ldots, f_s)$. The leading terms of the $g_i$ have to be unambiguous. We provide in definition 6 a precision notion of approximate Gröbner bases that is suitable with finite-precision coefficients. We define an approximate $D$-Gröbner basis accordingly.

To compute such $D$-Gröbner bases, we define in algorithm 2 the weak Matrix-F5 algorithm. Now let $w$ be a monomial ordering and let us assume that

- **H1** : $(f_1, \ldots, f_s)$ is a regular sequence.
- **H2** : the $\langle f_1, \ldots, f_i \rangle$ are weakly-$w$-ideals (see definition 7).

The definition 9 will then furnish a notion of sufficient precision, $prec_{MF5}(\{f_1, \ldots, f_s\}, D, w)$, which depends explicitly on the coefficients of the $f_i$, for the weak Matrix-F5 algorithm to compute an approximate $D$-Gröbner basis of $(f_1, \ldots, f_s)$, under **H1** and **H2** :

THEOREM 1.1. *Let $(f'_1, \ldots, f'_s)$ be approximations of the homogeneous polynomials $(f_1, \ldots, f_s) \in K[X_1, \ldots, X_n]^s$, with precision better than $prec_{MF5} = prec_{MF5}(\{f_1, \ldots, f_s\}, D, w)$. We assume that $(f_1, \ldots, f_s)$ satisfies **H1** and **H2**.*

*Then, an approximate $D$-Gröbner basis of $(f'_1, \ldots, f'_s)$ regarding to $w$ is well-defined. It can be computed by the weak Matrix-F5 algorithm, and the loss in precision is upper-bounded by $prec_{MF5}$. The complexity is in $O\left(sD\binom{n+D-1}{D}^3\right)$ operations in $K$, as $D \to +\infty$.*

We remark that the conjecture of Moreno-Socias implies that sequences satisfying **H1** and **H2** for the grevlex ordering are generic.

Furthermore, if one lean more on precision than on time-complexity, we show in theorem 4.6 that, under the assumptions **H1** and **H2**, we can drop the F5 criterion in order to obtain a smaller sufficient precision for an approximate Gröbner basis to be computed : $prec_{Mac}$, see definition 10. Time-complexity is then in $O\left(s^2D\binom{n+D-1}{D}^3\right)$ operations in $K$, as $D \to +\infty$.

## Structure of the paper

In section 2, we explain the setting of our paper : finite-precision complete discrete-valuation fields, and expose their basic properties regarding to precision. The section 3 is devoted to the analysis of the Gaussian row-echelon algorithm when performed over such fields. Section 4 applies this analysis to the study of the Matrix-F5 algorithm. We will then provide and analyze a weak Matrix-F5 algorithm, and a variant for precision-efficiency. Finally, section 5 provides some experimental examples.

# 2. FINITE-PRECISION CDVF AND COMPUTER ALGEBRA

The objective of this section is to introduce finite-precision complete discrete-valuation fields. We study the behavior of the precision when performing elementary operations.

## Setting

Let $K$ be a field with a discrete valuation $val$ such that $K$ is complete with respect to the norm defined by $val$. We will denote by $R = O_K$ its ring of integers, $m_K$ its maximal ideal and $k = O_K/m_K$ its fraction field. We shall denote by CDVF (complete discrete-valuation field) such a field. We refer to Serre's Local Fields [22] for an introduction to such fields. Let $\pi \in R$ be a uniformizer for $K$ and let $S_K \subset R$ be a system of representatives of $k = O_K/m_K$.

All numbers of $K$ can be written uniquely under its $\pi$-adic power series development form : $\sum_{k \geq l} a_k \pi^l$ for some $l \in \mathbb{Z}$, $a_k \in S_K$.

The case that we are interested in is when $K$ is not an exact field, but $k$ is, and symbolic computation can only be performed on truncation of $\pi$-adic power series development. We will denote by finite-precision CDVF such a field, and finite-precision CDVR for its ring of integers. Classical examples of such CDVF are $K = \mathbb{Q}_p$, with $p$-adic valuation, and $\mathbb{Q}[[X]]$ or $\mathbb{F}_q[[X]]$ with $X$-adic valuation. From now on, $K$ shall be such a finite-precision CDVF.

Let $A = K[X_1, \ldots, X_n]$, and $w$ a monomial order on $A$. Let $B = R[X_1, \ldots, X_n]$. We denote by $A_d$ the degree-d homogeneous polynomials of $A$, and when $u = (u_1, \ldots, u_n) \in \mathbb{Z}^n_{\geq 0}$, we shall write $X^u$ for $X_1^{u_1} \ldots X_n^{u_n}$. If $P \in A$ is an homogeneous polynomials, we denote by $|P|$ its degree.

## Precision

Elements of $K$ can be symbolically handled only up to a truncation of their $\pi$-adic power series development. Therefore, we manipulate quantities of the form $\sum_{i=k}^{d-1} a_i \pi^i + O(\pi^d)$, where $O(\pi^d)$ denotes $\pi^d R$.

There are two different objects that can be defined in order to study at what precision such a number is known : its **order** and its **relative precision**.

*Definition 1.* The **order**, or **absolute precision** of $x = \sum_{i=k}^{d-1} a_i \pi^i + O(\pi^d)$ is $d$. Its **relative precision** corresponds to its number of significant digits, and is given by $d - val(x)$.

Our main concern will be with $\pi$-adic numbers that are in $O_K$, thus, with $k \geq 0$. Therefore, we will focus on handling the order.

## Elementary operations

We can track the behavior of the order when performing elementary operations. For this, let $n_0 < m_0$, $n_1 < m_0$ be integers, and $\varepsilon = \sum_{j=0}^{m_0-n_0-1} a_j \pi^j$, $\mu = \sum_{j=0}^{m_1-n_1-1} b_j \pi^j$, with $a_j, b_j \in S_K$, and $a_0, b_0 \neq 0$.

PROPOSITION 2.1 (ADDITION).

$$(\varepsilon\pi^{n_0} + O(\pi^{m_0})) + (\mu\pi^{n_1} + O(\pi^{m_1})) = \varepsilon\pi^{n_0} + \mu\pi^{n_1} + O(\pi^{min(m_0,m_1)}).$$

*In particular, if $m_0 = m_1$, there is no loss either in order nor in relative precision (in contrast with real precision and its rounding error).*

PROPOSITION 2.2 (DIVISION).

$$\frac{\varepsilon\pi^{n_1} + O(\pi^{m_1})}{\mu\pi^{n_0} + O(\pi^{m_0})} = \varepsilon\mu^{-1}\pi^{n_1-n_0} + O(\pi^{\min(m_1-n_0, m_0+n_1-2n_0)}).$$

*In particular, the order for the division is the minimum of the relative precision.*

PROOF. We shall only prove the proposition 2.2.
First,

$$\frac{\varepsilon\pi^{n_1} + O(\pi^{m_1})}{\mu\pi^{n_0} + O(\pi^{m_0})} = (\varepsilon\mu^{-1}\pi^{n_1-n_0} + O(\pi^{m_1-n_0}))(1 + O(\pi^{m_0-n_0})^{-1}.$$

Since $(1+O(\pi^{m_0-n_0})^{-1} = 1+O(\pi^{m_0-n_0})$, then

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\varepsilon\pi^{n_1}+O(\pi^{m_1})}{\mu\pi^{n_0}+O(\pi^{m_0})} &= (\varepsilon\mu^{-1}\pi^{n_1-n_0}+O(\pi^{m_1-n_0}))(1+O(\pi^{m_0-n_0})),\\ &= \varepsilon\mu^{-1}\pi^{n_1-n_0}\\ &\quad + O(\pi^{\min(m_1-n_0,m_0+n_1-2n_0,m_1+m_0-2n_0)}).\end{aligned}$$

Finally, $m_0 > n_0$ implies $m_1 - n_0 < m_1 + m_0 - 2n_0$, and the result is therefore proven.

□

*Remark 1.* Given those proposition, we can already see why finite-precision CDVF have a very different behavior than floating-point numbers.

Indeed, if $a = x + O(\pi^n)$ and $b = y + O(\pi^n)$ are elements of $K$ known up to the order $n$, then $a+b = (x+y)+O(p^n)$ is known up to the order $n$. Because of **round-off errors**, this does not happen with floating-point numbers. For example, $(1+5*10^{-2})+(2+6*10^{-2}) = 3+1*10^{-1}+1*10^{-2}$ shows that even if $x$ and $y$ are known with precision $10^{-2}$, $x+y$ might not be.

As a consequence, finite-precision CDVF are much more amenable than floating-point numbers, and the following section will provide another instance of this with the study of the loss in precision when performing Gaussian elimination.

# 3. STUDY OF GAUSSIAN ROW-ECHELON FORM COMPUTATION OVER A FINITE-PRECISION CDVR

The aim of this section is to study the loss in precision when one perform Gaussian elimination to compute row-echelon form of matrices.

## 3.1 The Gaussian row-echelon form algorithm

We first begin with recalling in algorithm 1 what we mean with row-echelon form and Gaussian elimination.

*Definition 2.* Let $M$ be an $n \times m$ matrix. $ind_M : \{1, r\} \to \mathbb{Z}_{\leq 0} \cup \{\infty\}$, which maps $i$ to the index of the columns of the first non-zero entry on the $i$-th row of $M$. Then $M$ is said to be under row-echelon form if the index function is strictly increasing.

$M$ is said to be under row-echelon form up to permutation if there exists $P$ a permutation matrix such that $PM$ is under row-echelon form.

We emphasis that when eliminating coefficients with the pivot, we produce real zeroes, and not some $O(\pi^k)$. Otherwise, the resulting matrix is not under row-echelon form (up to permutation).

## 3.2 How to pivot

We know make clear how one can pivot and eliminate coefficients.

PROPOSITION 3.1 (PIVOTING). *Let $n_0 \leq n_1 < n$ be integers, and $\varepsilon = \sum_{j=0}^{n-n_1-1} a_j\pi^j$, $\mu = \sum_{j=0}^{n-n_0-1} b_j\pi^j$, with $a_j, b_j \in S_K$, and $a_0, b_0 \neq 0$.*

*We want to put a "real zero" on the coefficient $M_{i,j} = \varepsilon\pi^{n_1} + O(\pi^n)$, by pivoting with a pivot $piv = \mu\pi^{n_0} + O(\pi^n)$ on row $L$.*

**Algorithm 1:** The Gaussian elimination algorithm

**input** : $M$, an $n \times m$ matrix.
**output**: $\widetilde{M}$, a row-echelon form of $M$, up to permutation.

**begin**
  $\widetilde{M} \leftarrow M$ ;
  **if** $n_{col} = 1$ *or* $n_{row} = 0$ *or* $M$ *has no non-zero entry* **then**
    Return $\widetilde{M}$ ;
  **else**
    Find the coefficient $M_{i,1}$ on the first column with the smallest valuation;
    Swap rows to put it in first row;
    By pivoting with the first row, eliminates the coefficients of the other rows on the first column, and call $\widetilde{M}$ the result;
    Proceed recursively on the submatrix $\widetilde{M}_{i\geq 2, j\geq 2}$;
    Return $\widetilde{M}$;

*This can be performed by the following operation on the $i$-th row $L_i$ :*

$$L_i \leftarrow L_i - \frac{M_{i,j}}{piv}L = L_i + (\varepsilon\mu^{-1}\pi^{n_1-n_0} + O(\pi^{n-n_0}))L,$$

*along with the symbolic operation $M_{i,j} \leftarrow 0$.*

PROOF. The symbolic operations $M_{i,j} \leftarrow 0$ is just a part of the symbolic operation $L_i \leftarrow L_i - \frac{M_{i,j}}{piv}L$. Yet, for any other coefficient of $L_i$, symbolic computation is not relevant and what is performed is $L_i + (\varepsilon\mu^{-1}\pi^{n_1-n_0} + O(\pi^{n-n_0}))L$.

Indeed, we shall prove that $\frac{M_{i,j}}{piv} = \varepsilon\mu^{-1}\pi^{n_1-n_0} + O(\pi^{n-n_0})$.

This is a direct consequence of proposition 2.2 : $\frac{M_{i,j}}{piv} = \frac{\varepsilon\pi^{n_1}+O(\pi^n)}{\mu\pi^{n_0}+O(\pi^n)}$, and therefore $\frac{M_{i,j}}{piv} = \varepsilon\mu^{-1}\pi^{n_1-n_0} + O(\pi^{n-n_0})$, since $\min(n+n_1-2n_0, n-n_0, n+n-2*n_0) = n-n_0$.

□

## 3.3 Gaussian row echelon form computation

We are now able to track the loss of precision when performing Gaussian reduction on the rows of a matrix. We focus on computing the row echelon form of a matrix, without any operation on its columns. We then have the following result :

THEOREM 3.2. *Let $M$ be a matrix $n \times m$ ($0 \leq n \leq m$) with coefficients in $R$ known with flat absolute precision $k \geq 0$ and such that its principal minor $\Delta = det((M_{i,j})_{1\leq i\leq n, 1\leq j\leq n})$ is such that $val(\Delta) < k$.*

*Then, the maximum loss of absolute precision while performing Gaussian row-reduction on $M$ can be upper-bounded by $val(\Delta)$.*

To prove this result, we shall first study the pivoting process, and then conclude by induction on the number of rows.

### 3.3.1 The pivoting process

When performing the Gauss row-echelon form computation, we first look for the coefficient $M_{i,1}$ on the first column

with the smallest valuation. Then, we put it (via permutation of rows) to the first row, $L_1$.We shall denote it by $piv$, and let $n_1$ be its valuation.

As in proposition 3.1, we then pivot all the rows $L_i$ below the first one : $L_i \leftarrow L_i - \frac{M_{i,j}}{piv} L_1$, and if we denote by $M^{(1)}$ the resulting matrix, then the coefficients of the sub-matrix $M^{(1)}_{2\leqslant i\leqslant n,\ 2\leqslant j\leqslant m}$ are known up to $O(p^{n-n_1})$.

We shall then proceed recursively with the pivoting process on this sub-matrix.

### 3.3.2 Proof of the result

We first remark that the result is clear for matrices with only $n = 1$ rows.

We also remark that in the previous pivoting process, the operations performed on the rows change the principal minor only up to a sign, and we have $\Delta = \pm piv \times \det M^{(1)}_{2\leqslant i\leqslant n,\ 2\leqslant j\leqslant n}$.

Then the result is clear by induction on $n$ the number of columns.

### 3.3.3 A more refined result

In the following section, we apply this result on row-echelon form computation to study the computation of Gröbner bases. Yet, we shall study beforehand a result on what happens to the precision when there are may be more rows than columns.

PROPOSITION 3.3. *Let $M$ be a matrix $n \times m$ $(0 \leq n, m)$ with coefficients in $R$ known with flat absolute precision $k \geq 0$. Let $l \leq m$ be such that there is an $l$-minor on the $l$ first columns $C_1, \ldots, C_l$, with valuation strictly less than $k$.*

*Let $\Delta$ be the product of the pivots of the Gaussian row-reduction of $M$ up to column $l$.*

*Then, the maximum loss of absolute precision while performing Gaussian row-reduction on $M$ can be upper-bounded by $val(\Delta)$ and moreover, $val(\Delta)$ attains the smallest valuation of an $l$-minor on $(C_1, \ldots, C_l)$.*

PROOF. This comes from the following fact : in the ring of integers of a complete discrete valuation ring, an ideal $I$ is generated by any of its element whose valuation atteins $\min(val(I))$.

Here, if we define $I_{\text{minor}}$ to be the ideal in $R$ generated by the $l$-minors on $(C_1, \ldots, C_l)$, then $I_{\text{minor}}$ remains unchanged by any of the operations on the row of $M$ performed during the Gaussian row-echelon form computation (the matrices of these operations all are invertible over $R$).

Once the row-echelon form computation is completed, there is only one non-zero $l$-minor on $(C_1, \ldots, C_l)$, and its value is the product $\Delta$ of the pivots chosen during the computation.

Therefore, $\Delta$ generates $I_{\text{minor}}$, and atteins $\min(val(I))$. □

As a consequence, Gaussian reduction on $M$ up to column $l$ provides the choice of $l$ rows, linearly independent, with smallest loss in precision when those rows are echelonized.

# 4. MATRIX F5 ALGORITHM AND PRECISION ISSUES

In this section, we show that our analysis of the loss in precision during Gauss reduction can be applied to understand how we can compute Gröbner bases of some ideals in $K[X_1, \ldots, X_n]$. Our main tool will be Faugère's Matrix F5 algorithm in a slightly modified version, and to that intent, we first describe the idea of the Matrix F5 algorithm, in a general setting.

## 4.1 Matrix-F5

The main reference concerning Matrix-F5 is Bardet's PhD thesis [2].

We first recall some basic facts about matrix-algorithm to compute Gröbner bases, and present the Matrix-F5 algorithm.

*Definition 3.* Let $B_{n,d}$ be the basis of the monomials of degree $d$, ordered decreasingly regarding to $\omega$. Then for $f_1, \ldots, f_s \in A$ homogeneous polynomials, $d \in \mathbb{N}$, we define $Mac_d(f_1, \ldots, f_s)$ to be the following matrix :

$$\begin{array}{c} \\ x^{\alpha_{1,1}} f_1 \\ \vdots \\ x^{\alpha_{1,\binom{n+d-d_1-1}{n-1}}} \\ x^{\alpha_{2,1}} f_2 \\ \vdots \\ x^{\alpha_{s,\binom{n+d-d_s-1}{n-1}}} f_s \end{array} \begin{array}{c} x^{d_1} > \ \ldots \ > \ \ldots \ > x^{d\binom{n+d-1}{n-1}} \\ \left[\begin{array}{ccc} & & \\ & * & \\ & & \end{array}\right] \end{array}$$

with $|\alpha_{i,*}| + |f_i| = d$. The rows of the matrix $Mac_d(f_1, \ldots, f_s)$ are the polynomials $x^\alpha f_i$ written in the basis $B_{n,d}$.

We note that $Im(Mac_d(f_1, \ldots, f_s)) = I \cap A_d$, and the first non-zero coefficient of a row of $Mac_d(f_1, \ldots, f_i)$ is the leading coefficient of the corresponding polynomial.

THEOREM 4.1. *For an homogeneous ideal $I = (f_1, \ldots, f_s)$, $f_1, \ldots, f_s$ is a Gröbner basis of $I$ if and only if : for all $d \in \mathbb{N}$, $Mac_d(f_1, \ldots, f_s)$ contains an echelon basis of $Im(Mac_d(f_1, \ldots, f_s))$.*

By *echelon basis*, we mean the following

*Definition 4.* Let $g_1, \ldots, g_r$ be homogeneous polynomials of degree $d$. Let $M$ be the matrix whose $i$-th row is the row vector corresponding to $g_i$ written in $B_{n,d}$. Then we say that $g_1, \ldots, g_r$ is an *echelon basis* of $Im(M)$ if there is a permutation matrix $P$ such that $PM$ is under row-echelon form.

From this theorem, it is easy to derive an algorithm to compute Gröbner bases : compute the row-echelon form of all the $Mac_d(f_1, \ldots, f_s)$, for varying $d$. Faugère's F5 criterion provides a decisive improvement with a way to remove most of the unnecessary computation. One can look at Faugère's original article [6] or Bardet's PhD thesis [2] for an introduction to the F5 criterion, but it can be summed up in the following theorem.

THEOREM 4.2 (F5 CRITERION). *If $i \in [\![2, s]\!]$, and if we discard all the rows $x^\alpha f_j$ of $Mac_d(f_1, \ldots, f_i)$ such that $x^\alpha \in LM(I_{j-1})$, for all $j \in [\![2, i]\!]$, and if we denote by $\overline{Mac_d(f_1, \ldots, f_i)}$ this matrix, $Im(\overline{Mac_d(f_1, \ldots, f_i)}) = Im(Mac_d(f_1, \ldots, f_i))$. A reduction to zero of a row by elementary operations over the rows leads to a syzygy that is not principal.*

*If $(f_1, \ldots, f_s)$ is a regular sequence, then $\overline{Mac_d(f_1, \ldots, f_i)}$ is injective, and no reduction to zero can be performed.*

Theorem 4.2 yields the matrix-F5 algorithm : compute the row-echelon form of the $\overline{Mac_d(f_1, \ldots, f_i)}$ sequentially

in $d$ and $i$, with the computation of $\overline{Mac_{d-d_i}(f_1,\ldots,f_{i-1})}$ being enough to apply the F5-criterion on $Mac_d(f_1,\ldots,f_i)$ to provide $\overline{Mac_d(f_1,\ldots,f_i)}$. One can build a Gröbner basis of $I$ by adding to the $f_i$'s the polynomials corresponding to the rows of the row-echelon form of $\overline{Mac_d(f_1,\ldots,f_i)}$ which provide new leading monomial.

Nevertheless, there is no criterion on up to what $d$ Macaulay matrices should be echelonized. This is why we define $D$-Gröbner basis (see for example [8]) :

*Definition 5.* Let $I$ be an ideal of $A$, $w$ a monomial ordering on $A$ and $D$ an integer.

Then $(g_1,\ldots,g_l)$ is a $D$-Gröbner basis of $I$ if for any $f\in I$, homogeneous of degree less than $D$, there exists $1\leq i\leq l$ such that, regarding to $w$, $LM(g_i)$ divides $LM(f)$.

Thus, if we perform the Matrix-F5 algorithm up to the degree $D$ Macaulay matrix $Mac_D(f_1,\ldots,f_s)$, we obtain a $D$-Gröbner basis.

## 4.2 Precision issues

We shall now try to understand what happens when the entries are known only up to finite precision. To that intent, we might give a definition of what we expect an approximate Gröbner basis to be.

*Definition 6.* Let $f_i+\sum_{|u|=d_i}O(\pi^{n_{u,i}})X^u$, $1\leq i\leq s$ , be approximations of homogeneous polynomials in $A$. The $n_{u,i}$ belong to $\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}\cup\{+\infty\}$ . Then an approximate Gröbner basis, regarding to the monomial ordering $w$, of the ideal generated by these polynomials is a finite sequence $(g_i+\sum_{|u|=|g_i|}O(\pi^{m_{u,i}})$, $m_{u,i}\in\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}\cup\{+\infty\}$ , of approximation of polynomials such that : for any $a_{u,i}\in\pi^{n_{u,i}}R$, there exists some $b_{u,i}\in\pi^{m_{u,i}}R$ such that the $g_i+\sum_{|u|=|g_i|}b_{u,i}$'s form a Gröbner basis, regarding to $w$, of the ideal generated by the $f_i+\sum_{|u|=d_i}a_{u,i}X^u$'s. Moreover, we require that if $X^u$ is a monomial of degree $|g_i|$ such that $X^u>_w LM(g_i)$, then $m_{u,i}=+\infty$ (and the coefficient of $X^u$ in $g_i$ is zero). In other words, we require that the leading monomials of the $g_i$ does not depend on the approximation.

As seen in the previous section, if the input polynomials form a regular sequence, then all matrices considered in the F5 algorithm are injective. Yet, this is not enough in order to be able to certify that we get an approximate Gröbner bases.

For exemple,

$$\begin{bmatrix}1+O(\pi^{10}) & 0 & 1+O(\pi^{10}) & 0\\ 0 & 1+O(\pi^{10}) & 0 & 0\\ 1+O(\pi^{10}) & 1+O(\pi^{10}) & 1+O(\pi^{10}) & 1+O(\pi^{10})\end{bmatrix},$$

become, after the first step in the computation of its row-echelon form.

$$\begin{bmatrix}1+O(\pi^{10}) & 0 & 1+O(\pi^{10}) & 0\\ 0 & 1+O(\pi^{10}) & 0 & 0\\ 0 & O(\pi^{10}) & O(\pi^{10}) & 1+O(\pi^{10})\end{bmatrix},$$

and then :

$$\begin{bmatrix}1+O(\pi^{10}) & 0 & 1+O(\pi^{10}) & 0\\ 0 & 1+O(\pi^{10}) & 0 & 0\\ 0 & 0 & O(\pi^{10}) & 1+O(\pi^{10})\end{bmatrix},$$

Yet, there is no way, with only operations on the rows, to decide whether the coefficient of index $(3,3)$ is "really" zero or not. Thus, we can not know what is the row-echelon form of the matrix nor the leading monomials of the corresponding rows.

Therefore, the $(f_1,\ldots,f_s)$ such that our algorithm can give an answer have a very special shape :

Proposition 4.3. *To be able to compute the row-echelon form a matrix $M\in k^{n\times m}$; known only modulo $\pi^k$, $n,m\in\mathbb{N}^*$, it is enough to have, for every $j\in[\![1,min(n,m)]\!]$, a non-zero modulo $\pi^k$ minor in the matrix $(C_1,\ldots,C_j)$, where the $C_i$ are the columns of $M$.*

Proof. It exactly corresponds to the fact that we can find a non-zero pivot on each column, successively. □

With $w$ being our monomial ordering, an ideal $\langle f_1,\ldots,f_s\rangle$ such that the $Mac_d(f_1,\ldots,f_j)$ satifies proposition 4.3 is called a $w$-ideal.

$w$-ideal have been heavily studied in the field of generic initial ideal : for example, in [5], Conca and Sidman proved that the generic initial ideal (*i.e.* with a generic change of variable) of a generic set of points in $\mathbb{P}^r$ is a $w$-ideal.

Yet, this is not the generic case as, for example, Pardue showed in [15] that the ideal generated by 6 quadrics in 6 variables is not a grevlex-ideal.

Fortunately, we can study a somehow weaker condition, that is weakly-$w$-ideal.

*Definition 7.* Let $I$ be an ideal in $A$, and $w$ be a monomial order on $A$. Then $I$ is said to be a weakly-$w$-ideal if, for all leading monomial $x^\alpha$ of the reduced Gröbner basis of $I$, regarding to $w$, for all $x^\beta$ such that $|\alpha|=|\beta|$ and $x^\beta>x^\alpha$, $x^\beta$ belongs to $LM(I)$ (according to $w$).

Moreno-Socias conjectured that this is generic in the following sense :

Conjecture 1 (Moreno-Socias). *If $k$ is an infinite field, $s\in\mathbb{N}$, $d_1,\ldots,d_s\in\mathbb{N}$, then there is a non-empty Zariski-open subset $U$ in $R_{d_1}\times\cdots\times R_{d_s}$ such that for all $(f_1,\ldots,f_s)\in U$, $I=(f_1,\ldots,f_s)$ is a weakly-grevlex ideal.*

As a consequence, if Moreno-Socias conjecture holds, sequences satisfying **H1** and **H2** are generic.

We refer to Moreno's PhD Thesis [13] or Pardue's article [15] for an introduction to this conjecture.

*Remark 2.* The choice of grevlex is important : as seen in [15], if we take 3 quadrics in 6 variables, then generically, the ideal they span is neither lex nor weakly-lex ! Indeed, if $f_1=\sum_{1\leq i<j\leq 6}a_{i,j}X_iX_j$, $f_2=\sum_{1\leq i<j\leq 6}b_{i,j}X_iX_j$, and $f_3=\sum_{1\leq i<j\leq 6}c_{i,j}X_iX_j$,, then for lex $X_1>\cdots>X_6$, the leading terms of $I=(f_1,f_2,f_3)$ of degree 2 are $X_1^2$, $X_1X_2$ and $X_1X_3$. Yet, in degree 3, $X_1X_6^2>X_2^3$, $X_2^3\in LT(I)$ and $X_1X_6^2\notin LT(I)$, while $X_2^3$ is not a multiple of $X_1^2$, $X_1X_2$ nor $X_1X_3$. Therefore, the ideal generated by 3 generic quadrics in 6 variables is neither lex nor weakly-lex.

## 4.3 The weak matrix-F5 algorithm

We provide here the algorithm weak-F5M. We shall see in the following subsections that if $(f_1,\ldots,f_s)$ is a sequence of homogeneous polynomials in $A=K[X_1,\ldots,X_n]$ satisfying **H1** and **H2**, and if the $f_i$'s are known up to large enough flat precision $O(\pi^k)$, then weak-F5M can compute approximate $D$-Gröbner bases of $\langle f_1,\ldots,f_s\rangle$ .

**Algorithm 2:** The weak-F5M algorithm

**input** : $F = (f_1, \ldots, f_s) \in R[X_1, \ldots, X_n]^s$, homogeneous polynomials with respective degrees $d_1, \ldots, d_s$, and $D \in \mathbb{N}$, a term order $w$.

**output**: $(g_1, \ldots, g_k) \in A^k$, a D-Gröbner basis of $Id(F)$, or error if $(f_1, \ldots, f_k)$ does not satisfy **H1**, **H2** or the precision is not enough

**begin**
- $G \leftarrow F$
- **for** $d \in [\![0, D]\!]$ **do**
  - $\widetilde{\mathscr{M}_{d,0}} := \emptyset$
  - **for** $i \in [\![1, s]\!]$ **do**
    - $\mathscr{M}_{d,i} := \mathscr{M}_{d,i-1}$
    - **for** *$\alpha$ such that $|\alpha| + d_i = d$* **do**
      - **if** *$x^\alpha$ is not the leading term of a row of $\widetilde{\mathscr{M}_{d-d_i,i-1}}$* **then**
        - Add $x^\alpha f_i$ to $\mathscr{M}_{d,i}$
    - Compute $\widetilde{\mathscr{M}_{d,i}}$, the row-echelon form of $\mathscr{M}_{d,i}$, up to the first column with no non-zero pivot
    - Replace the remaining rows of $\widetilde{\mathscr{M}_{d,i}}$ by multiple of rows of $\widetilde{\mathscr{M}_{d-1,i}}$, so as to obtain a matrix in row-echelon form $\widetilde{\mathscr{M}_{d,i}}$.
    - **if** *$\widetilde{\mathscr{M}_{d,i}}$ could not be completed* **then**
      - Return "**Error,** the ideals are not weakly-$w$, the sequence is not regular, or the precision is not enough ".
    - **else**
      - Add to $G$ all the rows of $\widetilde{\mathscr{M}_{d,i}}$ with a new leading monomial.
- Return $G$

*Remark 3.* In order to facilitate the precision analysis, we assume, without loss of generality, that the input polynomials in the algorithm, $(f_1, \ldots, f_l)$, are in $R[X_1, \ldots, X_n]$.

*Remark 4.* At the beginning of the second *for* loop, the classical Matrix-F5 uses $\mathscr{M}_{d,i} := \widetilde{\mathscr{M}_{d,i-1}}$ instead of $\mathscr{M}_{d,i} := \mathscr{M}_{d,i-1}$. The former is faster ($\widetilde{\mathscr{M}_{d,i-1}}$ is already under row-echelon form), but we have chosen the latter since the analysis of the precision is simpler to analysis, and more efficient.

*Remark 5.* Instead of adding to $G$ all the rows of $\widetilde{\mathscr{M}_{d,i}}$ with a new leading monomial, it is enough to add the rows whose leading monomial is not a multiple of the leading monomial of a polynomial in $G$, therefore, we will directly obtain at the end a minimal Gröbner base.

## 4.4 Correctness

In this subsection, we prove that, regarding to symbolic computation (*i.e.* disregarding precision issues), the weak-F5M algorithm indeed compute $D$-Gröbner basis.

PROPOSITION 4.4. *Let $(f_1, \ldots, f_s) \in B^s$ be a sequence of homogeneous ideals satisfying **H1** and **H2**. Then for any $D \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$, the result of weak-F5M($(f_1, \ldots, f_s), D$) is a $D$-Gröbner basis of the ideal $I$ generated by $(f_1, \ldots, f_s)$. If $(f_1, \ldots, f_s)$ does not satisfy either **H1** or **H2**, an error is raised.*

PROOF. We refer to Bardet [2] for the correctness of the classical Matrix-F5 algorithm.

Let $(f_1, \ldots, f_s) \in B^s$, and, for any $d$, let us denote by $\overline{Mac_d(f_1, \ldots, f_i)}$ the Macaulay matrices with rows selected by the F5 criterion. Let $\widetilde{Mac_d(f_1, \ldots, f_i)}$ be the Gaussian row-echelon form of these matrices.

All we have to prove here is that if the ideal $I$ generated by $(f_1, \ldots, f_s)$ is weakly-$w$, then for any $d$, the remaining rows when the first column without pivot is found during the computation of the Gaussian row-echelon form of $\overline{Mac_d(f_1, \ldots, f_s)}$ are linear combinations of multiples of rows of $\widetilde{Mac_{d-1}(f_1, \ldots, f_s)}$.

Indeed, let us denote by $x^{\beta_u}$, for $u$ from 1 to $\binom{n+d-1}{n-1}$, the monomials of degree $d$, ordered decreasingly according to $w$, and let $l$ be the index of the first column without pivot found during the computation of the Gaussian row-echelon form of $\overline{Mac_d(f_1, \ldots, f_s)}$. Let us denote by $r_i$, with $i$ from 1 to $l-1$, the $l$ polynomials corresponding to rows of $\widetilde{Mac_d(f_1, \ldots, f_s)}$ with leading monomial $x^{\alpha_i}$. Let us denote by $L_u$ the remaining rows. Their leading monomials belong to the $x^{\alpha_u}$, with $u \geq l$.

Let $(g_1, \ldots, g_r)$ be the reduced Gröbner basis of $I$ according to $w$. Then, since there is no pivot on the column of index $l$, $x^{\alpha_l}$ is not a monomial of $LM(I)$. By definition of a weakly-$w$-ideal, this implies that if $x^{\alpha_u} \in LM(I)$ for $u \geq l$, then $x^{\alpha_u}$ is not one of the $LM(g_i)$. This means that $x^{\alpha_u}$ is a non-trivial multiple of one of the $LM(g_i)$, with $g_i$ homogeneous of degree strictly less than $d$. $x^{\alpha_u}$ is therefore a non-trivial multiple of a monomial in $LM(I \cap A_{d-1})$.

Thus, one can provide, for any $x^{\alpha_u} \in LM(I)$ with $l \leq u \leq \binom{n+d-1}{n-1}$ a multiple of a row of $\widetilde{Mac_{d-1}(f_1, \ldots, f_s)}$ with leading monomial $x^{\alpha_u}$. Let $m$ be the rank of $\widetilde{Mac_d(f_1, \ldots, f_s)}$, and let us denote by $t_i$, with $i$ from $l$ to $m$, the corresponding monomials. Since $(f_1, \ldots, f_s)$ is assumed to be regular,

then by the F5-theorem (see theorem 4.2), $m$ is the number of rows of $\overline{Mac_d(f_1,\dots,f_s)}$.

Then, since they all have a different leading monomial, the rank of $(r_1,\dots,r_{l-1},t_l,\dots,t_m)$ is $m$ and they form an echelon basis of $I\cap A_d$.

Since their leading monomials belong to the $x^{\alpha_u}$, with $u\geq l$, and they belong to $I\cap A_d$, the $L_u$ belongs to $Vect(t_l,\dots,t_m)$. The result is therefore proven.

This implies that we can replace the $L_u$ by multiples of rows of $\widetilde{Mac_{d-1}(f_1,\dots,f_s)}$ so as to obtain an echelon basis of $I\cap A_d = Im(\overline{Mac_d(f_1,\dots,f_s)})$. Therefore, the F5-criterion can be applied, and $\mathscr{M}_{d,i}=\overline{Mac_d(f_1,\dots,f_i)}$.

As a consequence, when all the $(f_1,\dots,f_i)$ defines weakly-$w$-ideals, the algorithm weak-F5M$((f_1,\dots,f_s),D)$ computes a $D$-Gröbner basis.

If $(f_1,\dots,f_s)$ is not such a sequence, it either means that $(f_1,\dots,f_s)$ is not regular or their exist some $i$ such that $(f_1,\dots,f_i)$ is not weakly-$w$. In the first case, it means some rows of one of $\overline{Mac_d(f_1,\dots,f_i)}$ reduce to zero (see [2]). Therefore, the completion of $\overline{Mac_d(f_1,\dots,f_i)}$ (by multiples of rows of $\widetilde{Mac_{d-1}(f_1,\dots,f_s)}$) in an echelon basis will not be possible, raising the error "**Error**, the ideals are not weakly-$w$, the sequence is not regular, or the precision is not enough".

In the second case, the completion of $\overline{Mac_d(f_1,\dots,f_i)}$ will not be possible either, raising the same error. □

## 4.5 Termination

Since we restrict to computation of row-echelon form of the Macaulay matrices up to degree $D$, there is no termination issue.

Yet, if we want a Gröbner basis instead of a $D$-Gröbner basis, one can use the following result : (see [3], [9], [12])

PROPOSITION 4.5. *If $(f_i,\dots,f_s)$ is a regular sequence of homogeneous polynomials in $A$. Then, after a generic linear change of variables, the highest degree of elements of a Gröbner basis of $<f_1,\dots,f_s>$ for the grevlex ordering is upper-bounded by the Macaulay bound : $\sum_{i=1}^{s}(|f_i|-1)+1$.*

## 4.6 Precision

We can now prove theorem 1.1. Let $(f_i,\dots,f_s)$ be a sequence of homogeneous polynomials in $A$ satisfying **H1** and **H2**. To that intent, we first define the $\Delta_{d,i}$, which corresponds to the precision sufficient, by proposition 3.3, to compute the $\widetilde{\mathscr{M}_{d,i}}$ from $\mathscr{M}_{d,i}$.

*Definition 8.* Let $l_{d,i}$ be the maximum of the $l\in\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ such that the $l$-first columns of $\overline{Mac_d(f_1,\dots,f_i)}=\mathscr{M}_{d,i}$ are linearly free. We define

$$\Delta_{d,i}=\min\left(val\left(\{\text{minor over the } l_{d,i}\text{-first columns of } \mathscr{M}_{d,i}\}\right)\right).$$

We can now define $prec_{MF5}$.

*Definition 9.* We define the Matrix-F5 precision of $(f_1,\dots,f_s)$ regarding to $w$ and $D$ as :

$$prec_{MF5}(\{f_1,\dots,f_s\},D,w)=\max_{d\leq D,\,1\leq i\leq s} val\left(\Delta_{d,i}\right).$$

With proposition 3.3 and the proposition 4.4 , this precision is enough to compute the $\widetilde{\mathscr{M}_{d,i}}$ : $prec_{MF5}(\{f_1,\dots,f_s\},D,w)$ is enough to compute the Gaussian row-echelon form of $\mathscr{M}_{d,i}$, and we then complete the matrix with multiples of $\widetilde{\mathscr{M}_{d-1,i}}$. Moreover, the leading monomials of the rows of $\widetilde{\mathscr{M}_{d,i}}$ are unambiguous.

Therefore, $prec_{MF5}(\{f_1,\dots,f_s\},D,w)$ is enough to compute approximate $D$-Gröbner bases by the weak-F5M algorithm.

## 4.7 Complexity

Asymptotically, the complexity to compute a $D$-Gröbner basis of $(f_1,\dots,f_s)$ is the same as the classical F5M algorithm, that is to say, $O\left(sD\binom{n+D-1}{D}^3\right)$ operations in $K$, as $D\to+\infty$. One can see [2] and [3] for more about the complexity of the Matrix-F5 algorithm.

## 4.8 Precision versus time-complexity

In order to achieve a better loss in precision for the Gaussian row-echelon form computation, we suggest the following weak-Matrix algorithm :

- Compute the $\mathscr{M}_{d,i}$ as before, with the F5 criterion;
- Instead of computing the row-echelon form of $\mathscr{M}_{d,i}$, one can perform the row-echelon form of the whole $Mac_d(f_1,\dots,f_i)$, up to the first column without non-zero pivot;
- Finally, build $\widetilde{\mathscr{M}_{d,i}}$ by filling $\mathscr{M}_{d,i}$ with the linearly independent rows found by the previous computation over $Mac_d(f_1,\dots,f_i)$ and multiples of rows of $\widetilde{Mac_{d-1,i}}$, into a matrix under row-echelon form.

The following quantity defines a sufficient precision to compute $D$-Gröbner bases through this algorithm.

*Definition 10.* Let

$$\square_{d,i}=\min\left(val\left(\{\text{minor over the } l_{d,i}\text{-first columns of } Mac_d(f_1,\dots,f_i)\}\right)\right).$$

We define the Macaulay precision of $(f_1,\dots,f_s)$ regarding to $w$ and $D$ as :

$$prec_{Mac}(\{f_1,\dots,f_s\},D,w)=\max_{d\leq D,\,1\leq i\leq s}\square_{d,i}.$$

Indeed, with proposition 3.3, $prec_{Mac}(\{f_1,\dots,f_s\},D,w)$ is enough to compute approximate $D$-Gröbner bases of sequences of homogeneous polynomials satisfying **H1** and **H2**. Moreover, such an algorithm would achieve the best loss in precision that Gaussian row-reduction of Macaulay matrices can attain, and $prec_{Mac}\leq prec_{MF5}$.

Yet, this precision would come with a cost in time-complexity : row-reducing of the full Macaulay matrix $Mac_d(f_1,\dots,f_i)$ is $O\left(\binom{n+d-1}{d}^2\times i\binom{n+d-1}{d}\right)$ (see [3]). This leads to a total time-complexity in $O\left(s^2D\binom{n+D-1}{D}^3\right)$ operations in $K$, as $D\to+\infty$, while when using the F5-criterion, we only need $O\left(sD\binom{n+D-1}{D}^3\right)$. To sum up :

THEOREM 4.6. *Let $(f'_1,\dots,f'_s)$ be approximations of the homogeneous polynomials $(f_1,\dots,f_s)\in K[X_1,\dots,X_n]^s$, with precision better than $prec_{Mac}=prec_{Mac}(\{f_1,\dots,f_s\},D,w)$. We assume that $(f_1,\dots,f_s)$ satisfies **H1** and **H2**. Then, the weak Matrix algorithm computes an approximate $D$-Gröbner basis of $(f'_1,\dots,f'_s)$ regarding to $w$, and the loss in precision is upper-bounded by $prec_{Mac}$. The complexity is in $O\left(sD\binom{n+D-1}{D}^3\right)$ operations in $K$, as $D\to+\infty$.*

## 5. IMPLEMENTATION

A toy implementation in Sage [18] of the previous algorithm is available at `http://perso.univ-rennes1.fr/tristan.vaccon/toy_F5.py`.

The purpose of this implementation was the study of the precision. It is therefore not optimized regarding to time-complexity.

We have experimented the weak-Matrix-F5 algorithm with homogeneous polynomials with varying degrees and random coefficients in $\mathbb{Z}_p$ : $f_1, \ldots, f_s$, of degree $d_1, \ldots, d_s$ in $\mathbb{Q}_p[X_1, \ldots, X_s]$, known up to initial precision 30. Computation where performed with respect to the grevlex ordering. We present the results in the following array :

| $d =$ | D | $p$ | iterations | maximal loss | mean loss |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| [3,4,7] | 12 | 2 | 20 | 6 | .02 |
| [3,4,7] | 12 | 7 | 20 | 3 | .09 |
| [2,3,4,5] | 11 | 2 | 2 | 7 | .15 |
| [2,3,4,5] | 11 | 7 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| [2,4,5,6] | 14 | 2 | 2 | 9 | 2.18 |
| [2,4,5,6] | 14 | 7 | 2 | 1 | .05 |

We emphasize that the precision was enough on every attempt.

We remark that these results suggest that the loss in precision is less when working with bigger primes. It seems reasonable since the loss in precision comes from pivots with positive valuation, while the probability that $val(x) = 0$ for $x \in \mathbb{Z}_p$ is $\frac{p-1}{p}$. Similarly, it increases when the size of the Macaulay matrices increases.

## 6. FUTURE WORKS

We suggest that if the initial polynomials $(f_1, \ldots, f_s)$ are known up to some precision $n_0 \gg prec_{MF5}$ and one want to achieve high precision on the result, then Hensel liftings could be used to speed-up the computation, as in [1], [17] or [27].

One would first truncate the $(f_1, \ldots, f_s)$ up to some sufficient precision $n_1 > prec_{MF5}$, and compute an approximate reduced $D$-Gröbner basis $(g_1, \ldots, g_t)$ up to precision $m_1$ along with the decomposition $g_i = \sum_{j=1}^{s} a_{i,j} + O(\pi^{m_1})$. Then, one could lift this approximate Gröbner bases up to the desired precision with Hensel lifting applied on the decompositions.

## 7. REFERENCES


[1] Arnold, Elizabeth "Modular Algorithms for Computing Groebner Bases", Journal of Symbolic Computation , April 2003, Volume 35, (4), p. 403-419.

[2] Bardet, Magali "Étude des systèmes algébriques surdéterminés. Applications aux codes correcteurs et à la cryptographie", thèse de doctorat, Université Paris VI, Décembre 2004.

[3] Bardet, Magali, Faugère, Jean-Charles, Salvy, Bruno On the complexity of the F5 Gröbner basis algorithm. — arXiv, 2013.

[4] Caruso, X & Lubicz, D. Semi-simplifiée modulo $p$ des représentations semi-stables : une approche algorithmique.

[5] Conca, A. & Sidman, J. Journal of Symbolic Computation archive Volume 40 Issue 3, September, 2005 Pages 1023-1038 Academic Press, Inc. Duluth, MN, USA

[6] Faugère, Jean-Charles A new efficient algorithm for computing Gröbner bases without reduction to zero (F5). In Proceedings of the 2002 international symposium on Symbolic and algebraic computation, ISSAC '02, pages 75-83, New York, NY, USA, 2002. ACM.

[7] Faugère, Jean-Charles & Liang, Y. Artificial discontinuities of single-parametric Gröbner bases. Journal of Symbolic Computation, 46(4):459-466, 2011.

[8] Faugère, Jean-Charles, Safey El Din, Mohab & Spaenlehauer, Pierre-Jean Gröbner Bases of Bihomogeneous Ideals generated by Polynomials of Bidegree (1,1): Algorithms and Complexity. Journal of Symbolic Computation, 46(4):406-437, 2011.

[9] Giusti, Marc Some effectivity problems in polynomial ideal theory, in Proc. Int. Symp. on Symbolic and Algebraic Computation EUROSAM 84, Cambridge (England), volume 174 of LNCS, p.159-171. Springer, 1984.

[10] Gräbe, Hans-Gert On lucky Primes. J. Symbolic Computation 15, 199-209 (1993).

[11] Kondratyev, A., Stetter, H.J. & Winkler, S. Numerical computation of Gröbner bases. Proceedings of CASC2004 (Computer Algebra in Scientific Computing), St. Petersburg, Russia, 295-306 (2004).

[12] Lazard, Daniel Gaussian Elimination and Resolution of Systems of Algebraic Equations, in Proc. EUROCAL 83, volume 162 of LNCS, p.146-157, 1983

[13] Moreno-Socias, Guillermo Autour de la fonction de Hilbert-Samuel (escaliers d'idéaux polynomiaux), Thèse, École Polytechnique, 1991.

[14] Nagasaka, K. A study on Gröbner basis with inexact input. Proceedings of CASC2009 (Computer Algebra in Scientific Computing): Springer LNCS 5743, 248-258 (2009).

[15] Pardue, Keith Generic Sequences of Polynomials, J. Algebra 324 (2010), no. 4, 579–590

[16] Pauer, Franz On Lucky Ideals for Gröbner Basis Computations. J. Symbolic Computation 14, 471-482 (1992).

[17] Renault, G. & Yokoyama, K. A Modular Method for Computing the Splitting Field of a Polynomial. In the proceedings of the 7th Algorithmic Number Theory Symposium (ANTS VII), Berlin, Germany, July 2006, LNCS 4076, Springer. DOI: 10.1007/11792086

[18] William A. Stein et al. Sage Mathematics Software (Version 4.7.2), The Sage Development Team, 2011, http://www.sagemath.org.

[19] Sasaki,T. & Kako,F. Sasaki, T., Kako, F.: Computing floating-point Gröbner base stably. In: Proceed- ings of SNC 2007 (Symbolic Numeric Computation), London, Canada, pp. 180–189 (2007)

[20] Sasaki,T. & Kako,F. Term cancellations in computing floating-point Gröbner bases. In Proceedings of CASC 2010, volume 6244 of Lecture Notes in Comput. Sci., pages 220–231, Berlin, 2010. Springer.

[21] Sasaki,T. A Theory and an Algorithm of Approximate Gröbner Bases, 2011 13th International Symposium on Symbolic and Numeric Algorithms for Scientific Computing

[22] Serre, J.-P. Local Fields, Graduate Texts in Mathematics, 67, Springer-Verlag, 1995

[23] Shirayanagi, K. & Sweedler,M. Remarks on automatic algorithm stabilization. J. Symb. Comput. 26, 761-765 (1998).

[24] Stetter,H.J. Approximate Gröbner bases – an impossible concept ? Proceedings of SNC2005 (Symbolic-Numeric Computation), Xi'an, China, 235-236 (2005).

[25] Taylor,R. & Wiles, A. Ring theoretic properties of certain Hecke algebras. Annals of Math. 141 (1995) 553-572.

[26] Traverso, C & Zanoni, A. Numerical stability and stabilization of Gröbner basis computation. Proceedings of ISSAC2002 (Intnl. Symposium on Symbolic and Algebraic Computation), ACM Press, 262-269 (2002).

[27] Winkler, Franz A $p$-adic approach to the computation of Gröbner bases, Journal of Symbolic Computation, 6/2 & 3, 287-304, 1988, ISSN 0747-7171.